

REMARKS

A. Request for Reconsideration

Applicant has carefully considered the matters raised by the Examiner in the outstanding Office Action but remains of the position that patentable subject matter is present. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the Examiner's position based on the above amendments to the claims and the following remarks.

B. Claim Status

Claims 1-15 are pending in this application.

All the claims have been amended herein to correct either claim objections or to place them in more conventional U.S. format.

Additionally, claim 1 has been amended herein to add the limitation of the catch projection and the annular groove in which the catch projection rides. This limitation had been part of claim 4, and thus claim 4 has likewise been amended to delete that portion of the claim. It will also be noted that claim 4 had not been rejected based on prior art and, it is respectfully submitted that the prior art does not teach such an annular groove in the bore and a catch projection located on the outer casing of the pressure piston.

Newly added claim 15 finds support in original claim 8 and claim 8 has likewise been amended to delete that portion which was added in claim 15. It is respectfully noted that no new matter has been added herein.

C. Specification Objections

The Specification had been objected to on page 8, line 14 and the Examiner had noted that reference character 12 should read reference character 20. Such a suggestion is appreciated and has been adopted herein.

D. Claim Objections

Claim 5 and claim 8 had been objected to.

Claim 5 had been objected to because it made reference both to claim 1 and claim 4.

Claim 5 had been amended herein to delete the reference to claim 4.

Claim 8 had been objected to as referring back to both claim 6 and 7. The reference to claim 7 has been deleted and the limitations concerning claim 7 have been added by way of new claim 15.

E. 112 Rejection

Claim 4 had been rejected as being indefinite for using the phrase "preferably".

Claim 4 has been amended herein to delete the word "preferable". In fact, as noted above, some of the limitations from claim 4 have been added to claim 1. Claim 4 has been amended herein to be directed to that subject matter which was referred to as the "preferable" subject matter.

F. Prior Art Rejection

Claims 1, 3, 5, and 13 had been rejected as being unpatentable over a combination of Schmidt and Takehara;

Claim 2 had been rejected as being unpatentable over a combination of Schmidt, Takehara and Murakami;

Claim 12 had been rejected as being unpatentable over a combination of Schmidt, Takehara and Holtzberg; and

Claim 14 had been rejected as being unpatentable over a combination of Schmidt, Takehara and Maas.

As the Examiner will note, claim 4 has not been rejected as being unpatentable over any of the cited references. It is respectfully submitted that claim 4 contained patentable subject matter in that claim 4 was directed to the projections which are on the outer casing

of a piston and the annular groove which is in the bore and, in which the projections move in an axial manner.

Respectfully, such elements are not taught in the prior art and therefore claim 1 as amended herein is patentable over the cited prior art references. Specifically, neither Schmidt, nor Takehara, Murakami, Holtzberg, or Maas teach or suggest such elements in their devices.

G. Conclusion

In view of the forgoing, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested.

Should any fees or extensions of time be necessary in order to maintain this Application in pending condition, appropriate requests are hereby made and authorization is given to debit account #02-2275.

Respectfully submitted,

LUCAS & MERCANTI, LLP

By:


Donald C. Lucas, 31,275
Attorney for Applicant(s)
475 Park Avenue South, 15th Floor
New York, New York
Tel. # 212-661-8000

DCL/ns